Appendix

[Vide answer to clauses (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) of starrted question No. 350 asked by Sri V. K. Kothandaraman at the meetting of the Legislative Assembly held on 19th September, 1958, page 266 supra.]

Statement showing the number of applications received from Industrialists engaged in Tanning Industry, their sanction and rejections, etc., for the years **1951** *to* **1957.**

Name of the district.	*Number of applications received.*	*Number of applications granted.*	*Number of applications rejected.*	*Reasons for rejection.*
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		1951-52.		
	No applications received from Tanning Industry,			
		1952-53.		
Coimbatore	1	..	1	Rejected by the Government on the recommendation of the Board as these industries were not eligible for aid as per the provisions of section 5 (1) (*b*) of the Madras State Aid to Industries Act.
Madurai	1	..	1	(same as above)
Tiruchirappalli ..	1	1	..	....
		1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56.		
	No applications received from Tanning Industry.			
		1956-57.		
Tanjore	2	..	2	One party withdrew his application. One application was rejected as it was found to be not a *bona fide* case during the investigation. The report from the concerned Tahsildar was also not favourable.
Tiruchirappalli ..	2	2	..	....
Salem	14	8	6	Two applications rejected as they did not produce the particulars called for. One rejected on account of applicant's failure to produce the documents, etc. Three were rejected as the sureties mentioned in the loan application forms did not prefer to stand as sureties.
Coimbatore	2	2	..	....
North Arcot	2	..	2	One rejected as the applicant was a regular defaulter in the payment of land revenue. Another rejected since the entire amount was asked for working capital and the need for such a large amount of working capital to the concern, which was not doing well and not run on modern lines was not justified.
Madras	1	..	1	Rejected as the loan applied for was only for carrying on his leather trade export and not for the improvement of thetannery.